

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 1, 3, 5, 8-20, 22, 24 and 27-39.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-20, 22, 24, 25, and 27-39 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

Informal Matters

In the Office Action mailed August 2, 2006, claims 6 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The specification has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter recited in claims 6 and 25. No new matter has been added, as the description of Fig. 26 has merely been amended in accordance with the specification as filed, as follows.

As noted in the amendment dated October 28, 2005, and as discussed in the personal interview of October 4, 2005, Fig. 26 illustrates a circuit configuration taught by the specification at page 2, line 24 to page 3, line 12, in which the differential input portion may include first and second transistors, a third transistor for keeping a minute current flowing through the first and second transistors, and a fourth transistor that may be connected in parallel with the third transistor, in which the third transistor may supply a predetermined drive current during one time period and the minute current during another time period. The description at page 3, lines 9-11 further discloses that a gate width of the third transistor may be smaller than a gate width of the fourth transistor. Moreover,

Fig. 26 is described as being "similar to the differential amplifier circuit of Fig. 8" but having transistor 30' in place of third transistor 3, transistor 30' receiving the signal CCS at a gate thereof rather than PDX received at a gate of transistor 3. The specification discloses at page 14, lines 2-15 and with respect to Fig. 8, that a minute current is supplied to the first and second transistors as a result of the third transistor (transistor 3) having a gate width smaller than that of the transistor 30.

The description of Fig. 26 has merely been amended to include the disclosure of, for example, page 3, lines 9-11, in which the gate width of the third transistor is smaller than the gate width of the fourth transistor. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by the amendments to the specification. Moreover, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 and 25 are fully supported by the specification as filed, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

If any additional amendment is necessary to overcome the rejection, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-20, 22, 24, 25, and 27-39 are in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing client matter number.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox, LLP



Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

25,891-

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

MLC:

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time